

Today's Topics:

Kenwood RZ-1 Wide Band Receiver
Looking for amplifier, Really All India Radio
More on the RZ-1
QSLs and SASEs
ROUTING
Tuning dipoles and antennas.
W3LPL Operator Fights Back

Date: Tue, 7 Nov 89 14:30:29 CST

From: Will Martin <wmartin@STL-06SIMA.ARMY.MIL>

Subject: Kenwood RZ-1 Wide Band Receiver

This was reviewed by Radio Nederland's Media Network people some months back, soon after it came out, and the general impression was that the RZ-1 was a real loser. I think Larry Magne reviewed it on Radio Canada International's SWL Digest program too, and came to largely the same conclusion.

As I recall, the shortwave performance was really poor. It didn't fare too well in the VHF/UHF range either. If I dig up anything written about this, I will post more detail. As an interim summary, though, I think it is safe to describe it as "overpriced junk".

Regards, Will

Date: Tue, 7 Nov 89 15:15:38 CST

From: Will Martin <wmartin@STL-06SIMA.ARMY.MIL>

Subject: Looking for amplifier, Really All India Radio

I'm sorry to say that it is just about impossible to get good, listenable reception from AIR here in the US. I have been trying for years, and get only marginally-intelligible signals at the best of times, even with an outdoor longwire antenna. What All India Radio needs to do is to work out a transmitter-time swap with one of the big religious broadcasters. The Voice of Free China, in Taiwan, did this with WYFR, and thereby became an easily-received and popular shortwave broadcaster, instead of being barely receivable.

There are enough Indian nationals (and people like myself who are interested in Indian music and culture) in North America that AIR would have an immediate and sizable audience if they would take this step. It could be done with very little expense -- certainly far cheaper than installing new high-power transmitters and trying to reach this continent directly!

To any Indian nationals reading this -- if you or your families have any influence at all in the Indian government or can reach officials of AIR, *please* push this idea.

Regards, Will Martin

Date: Tue, 7 Nov 89 15:46:58 CST
From: Will Martin <wmartin@STL-06SIMA.ARMY.MIL>
Subject: More on the RZ-1

I tried sending the poster who had asked about the RZ-1 these copies of comments from the net and got the following idiotic mail reject, so I'm sending this to the list instead.

Will

Date: Tue, 7 Nov 89 13:14:54 PST
From: Mailer-Daemon@Teknowledge.COM (Mail Delivery Subsystem)
Subject: Returned mail: Service unavailable
Message-Id: <8911072114.AB28947@Teknowledge.COM>
To: <wmartin@STL-06SIMA.ARMY.MIL>
----- Transcript of session follows -----
Cannot exec '/usr/bin/uux' errno=2
554 <polya!lucid.com!eb@Teknowledge.COM>... Service unavailable
----- Unsent message follows -----
Date: Tue, 7 Nov 89 14:34:16 CST
From: Will Martin <wmartin@STL-06SIMA.ARMY.MIL>
To: @BEAVER.CS.WASHINGTON.EDU:polya!lucid.com!eb@Teknowledge.COM
Subject: Re: Kenwood RZ-1 Wide Band Receiver

Here's some comments on the RZ-1 that I found I still had on-line:

Date: 28 Dec 88 12:49:47 GMT
From: att!ihuxz!parnass@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (Bob Parnass, AJ9S)
Subject: Kenwood RZ-1 [Wow!, or Bow-Wow?]

In article <1495@umbc3.UMD.EDU>, battle@umbc3.UMD.EDU (Mr. Rick Battle) writes:
> I was in my local ham radio store (Maryland Radio Center)
> when I saw the Kenwood RZ-1 for the first time....
> Any comments on the radio or my reactions.

Larry Wiland published an unflattering review of the RZ-1 on page 90 of 1/89 "Monitoring Times." Larry probably saved his readers (potential buyers) a lot of money.

--

~~~~~  
Bob Parnass AJ9S, AT&T Bell Laboratories - att!ihuxz!parnass - (312)979-5414

Date: 28 Dec 88 21:42:40 GMT  
From: hpda!hpcupt1!bmp@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (Brian M. Perkin)  
Subject: Kenwood RZ-1

There is an article about the RZ-1 in Jan 89 Monitoring Times.  
When I first saw the unit I was ecstatic because I thought  
I had finally found a unit that was a full coverage SW radio  
and scanner and would have the best features from both worlds.  
I was all set to sell my pro-2004 and buy a RZ-1.

The more I researched it, the less I liked it.  
The RZ-1 scans slowly,  
doesn't have SSB capabilities and is hard to program.

Monitoring times suggests waiting for the RZ-2 or the RZ-3 where  
the "bugs" will be worked out. I tend to agree with them. However  
if I had a DIN size car radio in my car, I could be tempted to  
replace it with the RZ-1.

Brian Perkin  
hpda!bmp  
N6RSW  
\*\*\*End\*\*\*

-----  
Date: Tue, 7 Nov 89 14:44:42 CST  
From: Will Martin <wmartin@STL-06SIMA.ARMY.MIL>  
Subject: QSLs and SASEs

If a "fill-in-the-blanks" generic QSL card is good enough for whatever  
purposes you want the card for, why not just fill in the blanks yourself and  
make up your own card if the other guy is too picayune to respond to your  
request, after you've tried once with a SASE?

Will

-----  
Date: 5 Nov 89 00:59:00 GMT  
From: mailrus!jarvis.csri.toronto.edu!torsqnt!tmsoft!masnet!canremote!  
bruce.chapman@iuvox.cs.indiana.edu (BRUCE CHAPMAN)  
Subject: ROUTING

Keith, this is a test of the route from Sasquatch, through Canada

Remote Systems in Toronto.

---

~ EZ-Reader 1.13 ~ I know that I should have read the DOC'S  
\* RNet 1.01: CanConfMail: Sasquatch BBS, Terrace, B.C. (604) 635-2184

-----

Date: 7 Nov 89 14:54:09 GMT  
From: att!cbnewsd!jmseb@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (john.m.sebeson)  
Subject: Tuning dipoles and antennas.

In article <1260002@hpmwtlb.HP.COM>, timb@hpmwtd.HP.COM (Tim Bagwell) writes:  
> It is not necessary to have a resonant antenna to efficiently radiate energy.  
.....  
>  
>  
> If your antenna SWR is 2:1, your losing about 10% of the transmitted power back  
> to the transmitter load! This is power that is not radiated anywhere. Contrast  
.....  
> 73's de WB9MVP/6

Tim, I don't believe you meant this literally. The only time SWR causes power to be lost is when you are using a lossy transmission line, like coax (types like RG58 being the worst). With a lossy line even a perfect match at the antenna will cause power to be lost; thats what a lossy line \*is\*. In this case, SWR only makes it worse. Also, with a lossy line and 2:1 SWR, maybe you lose 10%, maybe you don't: it depends on the type of line and its length.

Of course, there is no such thing as a completely lossless transmission line, but the closest thing is open wire feeders. If you use them, then it does not matter at all what the feedpoint mismatch is: all the power will be radiated. You only need a tuner to keep the rig happy.

~~~~~  
John Sebeson
KB8RY
Naperville, IL
~~~~~

-----

Date: Tue, 7 Nov 89 15:48:14 EST  
From: pescatore\_jt%ncsd%gte.com@RELAY.CS.NET

Subject: W3LPL Operator Fights Back

>From the continuing saga of QSLs:

Hollenack says:

> Or maybe a column in QST where you can send in the list of stations  
> that refuse to reply to SASE's so everyone can find out who does not  
> reply so you won't bother working them. Sort'a like a DX manager's list,  
> but for the stations that don't QSL.

Trey says:

I think these suggestions are more realistic. I would rather not see valuable inches of QST wasted on this, but it might be interesting to see someone like W6GO occasionally publish a "QSLing Hall of Shame."

One fact that has been overlooked in this discussion is that QSLing is a \*courtesy\*. If Frank refuses to honor the tradition of courtesy that QSLing had enjoyed through the years, then I (personally) am able to consider Frank nothing less than discourteous. If you want to "get back at Frank" and his success in contesting because he didn't send you a card, then I suggest that you never call Frank ever again in another contest. Furthermore, I suggest you contact his competitors, giving them a few extra points. Eventually, those handful of QSOs he loses because his philosophy about sending cards will cost him the difference between first and second place (or 10th and 11th -- a slot in the Top Ten, hee hee). When this happens, you will have a good laugh. After all, there are plenty of other hams in Maryland who are happy to send QSLs.

John WB2EKK says:

As a frequent operator at W3LPL (40 CW/20 SSB, usually) I feel compelled to respond to this latest raging debate. To me QSLing is much like giving out candy at Halloween. If you have kids, you tend to give out candy. If you like giving out candy, you give out candy. If you don't want your windows soaped, or your tree TPed, you give out candy.

Many who don't chase QSLs don't send QSLs. Many years I go out to a bar to avoid trick or treaters. I don't always fill out questionnaires when they come in the mail, even if they give me a stamp, or a little pencil (what do they think we would want those little pencils for, anyway?). If I received 2000 questionnaires a year, I might not respond to any, either.

The equivalent of soaping a contesteer's windows is to not work him in a contest, as Trey suggests. I have been severely berated for not QSLing by YUs

on 20 when operating at LPL, and my rate suffers for it. As a 100 per cent return QSLer, I think we would see a slight increase in score by QSLing. To be arrogant, we are whipping the competition by such wide margins that it would not mean a bit of difference in the final standings (let alone are we worried about the difference between 10th and 11th place). But I agree with the main point: if K7SS or KQ2M or WN4KKN at N5AU won't send you a QSL, don't work 'em. But lets not waste column space or energy on "QSLer Halls of Shame". Those actually cause competition to be the most shamed.

For all contests where the W3LPL station is operated by a single operator, by the way, the contest results will list the operator. On 160M and 10M contests in particular, and SSB SS, the guys who usually operate there will be glad to QSL. Just look in the results, find the operators name, and send the card direct.

For you DX stations who work the W3LPL multi-multi, there's hope yet, by the way. For the recent CQ WW SSB, all bands except 80 and 160 used K1EA computer logging software, and 80 and 160 are being merged in by hand. If we can talk Frank into paying for 20,000 or so cards, and volunteer to put labels on, we may bulk QSL soon.

-----

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #852

\*\*\*\*\*